5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

upon the man or woman who is being 'transferred', but as the result of the transaction this claims passes to *alter*.

The most familiar example of such a transfer is that of a woman who is 'given' by her brother to her prospective husband. When Lévi-Strauss developed the exchange or 'alliance' theory of social structure, he mainly discussed this type of transaction, whereby a social relationship between two male partners is created by the transfer of a woman from the control of one to the other. It is clear, however, that for every man who marries, a new relationship is also created between women who become sisters-in-law. In a very significant sense, the wife has taken the man from the sister. The Orokaiva acknowledge this aspect in two ways: by the gift of a pig made by the wife to the sister, and by the term of address *bi* (= penis) used between sisters-in-law.

We may thus see social structure as the product of a web of mediation. The usefulness of such a concept depends very much on the extent to which these intermediaries are institutionally involved in dealings between partners. Among the Orokaiva, their roles as intermediaries in exchanges between men are well articulated. As wives, as sisters and as mothers they link the very small patrilineal kinship groups into social units of a viable size. The system of marriage is a rather involved one, containing elements of restricted as well as of complex generalised exchange. Once this system of marriage is fully understood (Ch. X), the basic workings of Orokaiva society stand fairly clearly revealed. The study of Orokaiva exchange would not be adequate, however, without a brief consideration of the independent friendship network and the system of ranking, especially as it has affected recent Orokaiva-Australian relations (Ch. XI).

We thus return, though with a slightly more specific methodology, to Mauss' concept of exchange as a 'total phenomenon', in the sense that we posit the interrelations of notions of exchange occurring at any level of conceptualisation, social and non-social. It is in the very pervasiveness of such notions throughout the culture that we find evidence for its dominance in Orokaiva thought and institutions and for its power to mould social life.

REFERENCES

1 I refer especially to the discussion of the 'starting mechanism' of exchange in Gouldner 1960 and to Blau's (1964) criticism of Gouldner. My own view is that the approaches of these two authors are complementary.

2 Cunnison's translation (1954) suppresses in many passages Mauss' concern with economic and psychological factors. Compare Mauss: 'Quelle est la règle de droit *et d'intérêt* qui, dans les sociétés de type arriéré ou archaïque, fait que le présent reçu est obligatoirement rendu? ' (1966:148) and: 'In primitive or archaic types of society, what is the principle whereby the gift received has to be repaid? ' (Cunnison 1954:1). Compare also: 'ce type de droit et d'économie' (Mauss 153; Cunnison 5); omission by Cunnison of the last paragraph of Mauss 173; 'ces concepts de droit et d'économie (Mauss 267; Cunnison 70); 'en règles de droit, en mythes, en valeurs et en prix' (Mauss 275, Cunnison 77), etc. Recent criticism of Mauss by economic anthropologists sometimes reads as though it is based on translation rather than original.

3 For Lévi-Strauss' discussion of the notion of mediation see *La Pensée Sauvage*, Ch. VIII and *passim*.

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

gift exchange differs to some extent from the Western exchange of Christmas presents with which it is sometimes compared. In the former, as opposed to the latter system, the acquisition of desired scarce resources is a most important consideration; the fostering of social relationships is equally important in both systems.

Westerners often criticise Melanesians for being too grasping and mean in gift exchange. Absurd though this criticism may seem, it arises from a real cultural difference: Westerners depend on institutions other than gift exchange for the acquisition of desired scarce resources. Hence the institution of exchanging Christmas presents need serve no other end but the fostering of social relations. For the Melanesians, with a rudimentary market system, gift exchange must serve economic as well as social ends. This lack of differentiation leads to the necessary consequence that social exchange is rarely effective unless prestations of economic value are exchanged between the partners and both sides are satisfied with what they receive.

Orokaiva regard exchange relations as the *causa efficiens* of social relations; they cannot envisage any significant social relations in the absence of exchange relations and they ascribe all breakdowns in social relations to an antecedent breakdown in exchange relations. They support this view with cogent and sophisticated arguments, which will be presented throughout this work. Here, I shall quote only a few examples of their reasoning so as to give it some *a priori* plausibility.

One evening a women's dance practice was interrupted by an angry man calling his wife to come home. It turned out that his son's wife, who lived with the couple, had run off and returned to her village. The immediate cause of this escape was clear: he had tried to seduce her. He considered himself entirely justified in doing so as the young woman belonged to his son. To which his wife retorted that the son was hers also. The loss of the young woman, for whom bride price had been paid and whom the son would certainly expect to be reserved for him, was very serious and led to a meeting involving his clan, his wife's clan and the son's wife's clan. This meant that all of Sivepe was there, as well as a number of people from neighbouring Sasembata, the son's wife's village. A councillor was invited to adjudicate. The Sasembata people's arguments were interesting but not relevant here. The meeting was mainly concerned with what was regarded as the key problem: the conflict between the older couple. Their marriage had been unhappy for some years. The wife had been away to Port Moresby for a long time; when she returned the husband had gone away, also to Port Moresby. When he came back he found his wife was having an affair with another man. He himself was constantly chasing his three daughters-in-law.

The meeting addressed itself to the question of what had caused this marriage breakdown. The husband had been wrong to pursue his daughters-in-law; the wife had been wrong in committing adultery, and so on. But how did it begin? Why had the wife gone to Port Moresby in the first place? So she told the tale. She had had diarrhoea; her husband had become angry. But she kept on going out of the house. She then took some of his betelnuts to chew, and he told her in a fury that he did not want her to go to his garden any longer. She did not get food for a day and a half and then left for Port Moresby.

No further questions were asked. Once the husband had confirmed this

S: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

account, the meeting ruled that the cause of the marriage breakdown was the husband's refusal to allow her to enter his garden. The attempted seduction, the adultery, the escapades to Port Moresby, the violent words and acts that had characterised the marriage over the years were all declared to be blameworthy, but the most serious of the offences was the husband's act in denying his wife entry to the taro garden. This signified the breaking off of the basic exchange relation in a marriage whereby the man clears the garden, the wife harvests the taro, and cooks it, and the husband and wife both eat it. I was told that when this exchange relation is broken, the marriage itself breaks down.

Why it is the taro garden where exchange between husband and wife is so important will be discussed in Chapter VI. I am concerned here to show that in tracing the cause of a marriage breakdown, what the Orokaiva seem to be looking for is evidence of a breakdown in the area of gift exchange. As long as the husband still gives his wife taro, there may be considerable difficulties between them, but these are not *defined* as a breakdown in Orokaiva culture unless there is a breakdown in Obligatory exchange.

Another such case was that of a man who took sides in a quarrel between his brother and another man who had been trying to rape, i.e. seduce by force, that brother's wife. I thought that the village generally would be on the brother's side, as rape is disapproved of, but almost everyone took the side of the rapist and the man who took the side of his brother had to leave the village. The man who was expelled had a long history of trouble making. During my stay he had been involved in every fight except those between husbands and wives. He had also committed rape, his victim being a prohibited partner under the incest rules. His trouble was, so I was told, that no woman wanted him. I asked my informants why this was. The reason was that he had been married previously, he had maltreated his wife and she had run away. Now nobody would help him. And why would nobody help him? Well, brideprice had been paid for his first wife; it had been lost through his fault, and that was the 'real' reason why nobody supported him in the quarrel. Here again we notice that the cause of the trouble was the breakdown of an exchange cycle. When a man has been helped in paying brideprice he has an obligation towards his clansmen to hold his wife, raise a family and be a support for the others. He must manage the relationship with his own affines properly and make them into valuable exchange partners.

In both instances a basic exchange cycle had been broken and that was thought to constitute the essence of the relationship. In the first case this was the exchange between man and woman in making their own contributions and deriving their own benefits in the taro garden – a cycle of exchange which parallels the cultivation cycle of the taro itself. In the second case it was the exchange between clansmen which is complete only when the man who received the brideprice provides recruits for the clan, as well as a steady new affinal alliance. It does not concern me here whether psychologists would, in such cases, accept the exchange breakdown as the real cause of the social breakdown; I have illustrated that the Orokaiva view social breakdowns in this manner.

5: Schwimmer E-4,5 (1966-1967) 1973
OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23
Mountain Orokaiva

writings of Berndt, Brookfield and Brown, Hogbin, Lawrence, Meggitt, Rappaport, Salisbury, Serpenti, Wagner and several others. The Orokaiva system falls within this general pattern, though with less emphasis on overriding rights held by clan and lineage, and more emphasis on individual rights than, for instance among the Siane and Mae Enga, less emphasis on corporate leadership than among the Garia, and more incidence of duality of rights than among the Chimbu, and so forth. Though the time has come when a comparative study of these systems could profitably be undertaken, it falls outside my present purpose which is to analyse the significance of land transactions, especially among the Orokaiva.

In order to carry out this analysis, we must first describe the basic categories of land transactions. We shall not use the term 'transactions' solely in a legal and economic sense, but more broadly in accordance with Mauss' concept of exchange as a total phenomenon. Thus, land enters crucially in 'transactions' between husbands and wives, and between men and spirits, and these 'transactions' will be considered before we turn to the more familiar topic of transactions between men. Here we have to distinguish between transactions within and outside the patrilineage. Our general argument will be that all of them occur as part of a continuing series of social exchanges, and that useholds granted on varying conditions must be regarded basically as benefits exchanged for other past or future benefits. In as much as paternal protection and filial service are very common objects of social exchange in these transactions, paternal protection being mediated by land grants, we may observe the practical operation of a system of patrifiliation.

A few words should first be said about the significance of land itself. The Orokaiva spend most of their days in their individual garden plots. They are tied to them not only by a total dependence on the produce, but also by deep bonds of affection. A man and his wife like nothing better, generally, than to spend the whole day, and virtually every day, in their garden together. These are intimate places where nobody would go without an invitation and where nobody is disturbed or called away except in a serious emergency. They are the most private places the Orokaiva has, much more private than the village houses where every sound and movement can be seen or overheard. Even so, physical privacy is secured often by no more than a narrow ring of second growth around the cultivations. Many people have a garden house, ornamental shrubs, places to rest and sit. Orokaiva gardens can be very homely and beautiful. People rest there in the heat of the day. They are favourite places for love-making.

The most ubiquitous of all social transactions mediated by the land occur between husband and wife. Perhaps the most important rights and obligations arising out of marriage have to do with garden land. Both the male and female gardening tasks are, of course, learnt before marriage. Bachelors have their own gardens in which they do all the work which is not specifically set aside for women and taboo to men. They clear the land; they help with planting (using the digging stick); they protect the land against pigs and other dangers; they weed. It is a fact, already observed by Williams, that a girl choosing a husband takes serious account of the state of the garden of her intended spouse. She does not like to marry a man whose garden is in a poor state. The bachelor is assisted by a sister, or brother's wife, or by his mother with the dropping of seed into the

ground, and with harvesting, which he may not do. Upon marriage, the new wife is usually expected to garden on her husband's land. There is a fiction that, at the time of marriage, she 'does not know' the work she is expected to do on the land of her new affines. Her mother-in-law has to instruct her and it is only after such an apprenticeship that her husband's people consider her competent to tend taro on their land, harvest it and offer it to visitors in proper style. She would usually have been trained in these tasks by the women of her own clan, but the subtleties of family traditions differ.

As against these male and female obligations, we may note some clearcut rights: the man's right to his wife's labour and the wife's equally important right of unlimited access to the husband's garden land and to its produce. This right extends not only to harvesting food for the household, but also for gifts she may choose to make outside the household, providing that she manages the food supply so as to avoid shortages. A domestic dispute I observed in Sivepe (referred to in Chapter III above) illustrates the importance attached to this married woman's right. When this dispute was adjudicated, the 'explanation' of the breakdown of the marriage was found in a single incident, namely the husband's instruction to his wife not to go to his garden again. Here, in the view of everyone present, lay the 'root' of the trouble, a judgement with which the husband was willing to agree. This prohibition to go to his garden is one of the few things a husband is on no account to utter to his wife; it amounts to total repudiation of the conjugal relationship.

This brief discussion of social practices has already indicated that a garden plot is a gift made by a man to a woman, while the productiveness of the land is a gift from a woman to a man (because a man can neither plant nor harvest). Let us now consider to what extent the nature of these gifts may be clarified in the light of rituals, myths and indigenous explanations. It will be best to begin with some legal ideas about land. As has been pointed out by Salisbury (1962: 67ff.) among others, several sets of rights arise with respect to any one piece of land: rights of the village, of the clan, of the lineage, and of the 'father of the ground' or trustee. It is the last-mentioned person who assigns a piece of land (*enda*) to a cultivator for the purpose of making a garden (*pure*). The cultivator to whom land may be assigned may be either male or female. Among the Orokaiva it is common for women to have land assigned to them for cultivation in their own right, even though most land is assigned to males. They receive this land mostly from a father or brother, sometimes from their mother. When a woman wishes to have a garden established on her land, she (voluntarily) transfers the land to her husband or another male on a temporary basis so that he can carry out the crucial male tasks without which the garden cannot be made. These tasks are ritual as well as productive. It is common for the men of a clan to hold a feast together and to kill a pig from which they eat and obtain strength (*ivo*), before clearing new ground. The fertility of the soil depends greatly on getting a good burn after clearing, and a good burn depends on climatic conditions that can never be wholly predicted. I was unable to find out much about the ritual connected with clearing but gather it had to do with control over the sun and the rain. Another magical danger that arises in new gardens comes from the ghosts (*sowai*) lurking in the reverted gardens or bush that is being cleared. The garden thus established is the gift made by the man to the woman; the *pure* is

27: Schwimmer E-5 (1966-1970) 1979 OJ23 Orokaiva OJ23

121 between the other two. Their existence is known, but some will not see their cognitive genesis. They tend to arise as they are logically implied by the two dominant ones; anyone who does not like 1 and 2 cannot help but think of 3 or 4 or both.

Identification in the Creation of Use Values

461 When Councillor Colin said that '*pure ari*' did not begin until Jesus Christ (i.e. people did not 'work' before that time) he ignored that *pure ari* in its primary meaning stands for 'to garden' and *pure* is a garden. From an empirical viewpoint we know exactly what goes on in a Sivepe garden, as Waddell has carefully measured it. The daily visit to the garden described by informants as *pure ali* takes a mean of 265 minutes of which 'main task' and 'ancillary tasks' take up in all 44.2% (Waddell and Krinks 1968: 113). The rest is devoted to travel, rest, meals, cooking, washing, other tasks. People always go to the *pure*; they do what they need to do. The amount of 'work' they have does not determine how long they stay. Sometimes they 'work' very hard, sometimes hardly at all.

The gardening tasks are done at a moderate pace which is pleasurable. Rushing and heavy burdens are avoided when possible, but when they are necessary they are classified as 'toil' (*pure gaiha*) and people rest later to make up for it. The only time measures used are: early morning, midday, afternoon (meaning: time to go home) and evening-night (meaning: after supper). Though gardens have a principal crop, mostly taro, the subsidiary crops, ornamental trees, garden house etc. are charmingly landscaped so that the garden is in a sense an artistic creation (Malinowski 1935; F. Panoff 1969). Whether rows are regular and what is the general standard of husbandry are very much individual matters. It is said that by looking at a person's garden one can read his or her character. Among the Orokaiva the girls are said always to look at a boy's garden before marrying him. De Coppet (1976) reports the same for the Are'are of Malaita, except that it is the girls who are more under scrutiny. The criteria would partly be the style of the garden, showing a pattern of mind, but also and largely the size of the garden, the size and the health of the plants, the quality of the varieties.

[805] [241] [829] [581]

241 773 824 One could keep on with such description for a long time without coming closer to defining garden work as a concept. Myths and rites prescribe details of the gardening cycle for each of the principal crops while at the same time establishing identification between grower and crop: taro is a mother; a mother Taro is invoked; married women think of their taro as their children. The